

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 370

CE 000 294

AUTHOR Semberger, Franklin M.
TITLE Selected Effects of the Participation of Adults in
Program Planning.
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 115p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State
University

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Adult Leaders; Adult Learning; *Conferences;
*Doctoral Theses; Group Dynamics; *Leader
Participation; *Leadership; Planning Meetings;
*Program Planning; Sociometric Techniques

ABSTRACT

The overall purpose of the study was to assess the effect of various levels of conferee participation in the process of conference program planning. The first hypothesis tested was that conferees assigned to committees most actively engaged in the planning and implementation of a conference will perceive it as more effective than will conferees assigned to less active committees. This hypothesis was rejected. The second hypothesis was that conferees assigned to active planning conference committees are perceived by other conferees as influential. This hypothesis was rejected also. The third hypothesis tested was that conferees assigned to active planning committees are perceived as progressively more influential from the beginning to the end of a conference than conferees who are least actively engaged. This hypothesis, too, was rejected. (MS)

ED 083370

SELECTED EFFECTS OF THE PARTICIPATION OF ADULTS IN PROGRAM PLANNING

(Publication No.)

Franklin M. Semberger, Ph.D.
The Florida State University, 1972

Major Professor: Irwin R. Jahns

The overall purpose of this study was to assess the effect of various levels of conferee participation in the process of conference program planning.

The study population consisted of the fifty participants of the Florida Institute for Correctional Educators. Their participation in conference planning and implementation was operationalized by placing one-half of the study population on three different conference committees and placing the remaining conferees into a control group.

Prior to the conference a planning committee was selected. This committee, composed of six future conference participants, had the most input for planning by formulating substantive subject matter of the conference. At the beginning of the conference a steering committee of five members and a feedback committee of fifteen members, who had the least input for planning, were randomly chosen from participants not previously selected for the planning committee.

CE 000 294

Three general hypotheses were tested. The first was H1: Conferees who are assigned to committees most actively engaged in the planning and implementation of a conference will perceive a conference as more effective than conferees who are assigned to committees least actively engaged. Data were collected from participant responses to the Welden Scale. No significant differences, at the .05 level, were discovered among all participant groups. All participant groups tended to be satisfied with the conference and all participant groups believed that the conference aided in achieving selected values. Therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected. One may conclude that participation at various levels in the planning and implementation of the conference program has made no difference insofar as conferee satisfaction with the program is concerned and that participation at various levels in the planning and implementation of the conference program has made no difference in the extent to which the conference helped conferees achieve selected values.

The second hypothesis tested was H2: Conferees who are assigned to committees most actively engaged in the planning and implementation of a conference will be perceived by other conferees as more influential than those conferees who are assigned to committees least actively engaged. The data were collected from a sociometric test. Participant groups, at the .05 level, were not perceived as significantly different insofar as influence is concerned.

Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected. Since statistically no one participant group was perceived as having more influence on the program content and structure than another, one could conclude that centrality to decision making may not be crucial or important in affecting participation.

The third hypothesis tested was H3: Conferees who are assigned to committees most actively engaged in the planning and implementation of a conference will be perceived as progressively more influential from the beginning to the end of a conference than conferees who are least actively engaged. The data were collected from a sociometric test. Each participant group was compared with conferee perceptions of that group over the four tests to discern if perceived influence changed during the course of the conference. Participant groups, at the .05 level, were not perceived as significantly different insofar as influence over time is concerned. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

This document had already been listed on the Acquisitions Data List before we ceased input. Please process them in the usual way but keep this flag on each document so that it reaches Leasco. I have talked this over with Orabelle Nuthall and there will be no trouble as long as you alert her by retaining the flag.

Edith W. Bennett

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

SELECTED EFFECTS OF THE PARTICIPATION OF
ADULTS IN PROGRAM PLANNING

By
FRANKLIN M. SEMBERGER

A dissertation submitted to
the Department of Adult Education
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Irwin R. Jahn
Professor Directing Dissertation

Vernon Fox

Maynard Schmitt

George F. P. Her

Philip R. Fordyce
Dean, College of Education

December, 1972

Ad 014478
CE 000 294

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is dedicated to Dr. Irwin Jahns, Chairman of this writer's Doctoral Committee, whose patience with my ignorance at times appeared inexhaustible; and to committee members Dr. Wayne Schroeder, whose intellectual stimulation prodded this writer to question each part of his academic career; Dr. Vernon Fox, whose patience and understanding provided the catalyst for undergraduate as well as graduate study; and Dr. George Aker, who provided a role model, the financial wherewithall to complete the academic experience, as well as an office to be painted.

One would be remiss in not giving credit to significant others who provided much needed and necessary support. So, to my loving wife, Betty, who never said no, and to our four children, Susan, John, Jeff, and Adam, whose suffering and deprivation were mitigated by the love of this writer's better half, I say, without you, all would be unnecessary. To Dr. Truett A. Ricks, alter-ego. To Dr. Gerald Hanberry, who caused this writer to say, "If Gerry can get a Ph.D., so can I." To Mrs. Harriett Brown, who was a friend as well as a typist and, finally, to the itch that wouldn't scratch!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	11
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. BACKGROUND.	1
Introduction	
Statement of the Problem	
Significance of the Problem	
Review of the Literature	
Summary	
Hypotheses Derived from the Literature	
II. METHODOLOGY	28
Introduction	
Selection of Participants	
Determination of Committee Structure and Function	
Selection of Learning Groups and Committees	
Data Collection, Reduction and Analysis	
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	40
Introduction	
Demographic Attributes	
Conference Effectiveness	
Conferee-Perceived Influence	
Conferee-Perceived Influence Over Time	
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	69
Objectives and Methodology	
Findings and Conclusions	
Limitations of the Study, Implications and Suggestions	
Implications	
Appendix	
A. PLANNING COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION.	82

TABLE OF CONTENTS.--Continued

	Page
B. STEERING COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION.	92
C. WELDEN SCALE.	94
D. SOCIOMETRIC TEST.	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY	102
VITA	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of Committee Assignments for Each Learning Group.	33
2. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Participants in the Florida Institute for Correctional Educators	41
3. ANOVA of Overall Conference Satisfaction Based on Selected Criteria as Ascribed by Each Participant Group on a Five Point Scale. . .	45
4. ANOVA of Selected Values Held by Conferees and the Achievement of Selected Values by Each Committee and the Control Group on a Four Point Scale	47
5. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Members in Each Conference Committee on a Three Point Scale.	49
6. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Members in Each Conference Committee on a Three Point Scale.	51
7. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Members in Each Conference Committee on a Three Point Scale.	54
8. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Members in Each Conference Committee on a Three Point Scale.	57
9. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed Over Time by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Participant Group Members on a Three Point Scale.	60
10. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed Over Time by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Participant Group Members on a Three Point Scale.	62

LIST OF TABLES.--Continued

Table	Page
11. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed Over Time by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Participant Group Members on a Three Point Scale.	64
12. ANOVA of Influence Ascribed Over Time by Conferees to Selected Characteristics of Participant Group Members on a Three Point Scale.	66

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Introduction

This chapter is presented in four basic parts. First, the statement of the problem, second, the significance of the problem, third, a review of related literature, and fourth, hypotheses derived from the literature.

Statement of the Problem

It is often contended by educators of adults, that adults who attend conferences should participate in the planning and execution of their program. If this contention is to be accepted, procedures that will maximize such participation must be explored.

This study probed into participational factors affecting outcomes of a conference program planning process. The overall purpose of this study was to assess the effect of various levels of conferee participation in the planning process. More specifically, the objectives were (1) to assess conferee ascribed conference effectiveness as affected by differences in participational activities and (2) to assess whether conference participants who were

more central to program decision making were perceived by other conferees as more influential than those who were less central.

Significance of the Problem

Adult educators have been involved in serious discussions concerning the how, why, and who of participation for many decades. The American Association for Adult Education closed its first decade of existence with a book directly concerned with democratic free choice as it applies to the field.¹ A "First Principle" of adult education had been articulated internationally by the Adult Education Committee of the British Ministry of Reconstruction in a book commonly called The 1919 Report. This first principle is posited as being

The fact that adult education is concerned with men and women of more or less mature experience, who are conscious either of their own needs or of social needs, gives to it a special character. Adult education will clearly thrive only under conditions which allow of the fullest self-determination on the part of the students as regards the studies to be pursued, the choice of the teacher, and the organization of the class. Our proposals, therefore, are framed with a view to ensuring the maximum liberty to students and establishing the right relation between the students, the teachers and the bodies providing education--a relation which should be one of cooperation.²

¹Adult Education and Democracy (New York: American Association for Adult Education, 1936).

²A Design for Democracy (London: Max Parrish and Co., 1956), p. 149.

Boyle has expanded the principles to include several other factors. One of which, specifically, his Principle number six, is that

Democratic processes should be used whenever possible in planning the program. Democratic group processes are based on the conviction that everyone who is affected by a policy, decision or a program should share in its making.³

There appears little in the way of definitive statements by educators which can be extrapolated to infer logical disagreement with the inherent goodness of participatory democracy in general education. More specifically, adult educators appear to have universally accepted the fact of participation in program planning as well as assuming positive benefits derived from the process.

Not only do educators desire to meet with potential students in order to ascertain their desires but there is a universally held view that participation in program planning by community members as well as adult educators is good in itself. The benefits flowing from participation are many. When individual students participate, (1) they have greater responsibility in the enterprise because they have helped in its creation; (2) they may be led to recognize needs which before were not consciously felt; and (3) planning can be as much a learning experience as can direct instruction.⁴

Much of the literature of adult education recognizes the fact that it is oft-times difficult if not impossible

³Patrick G. Boyle, "Planning with Principles," Adult Education, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Autumn, 1958), p. 22.

⁴Jack London, "Program Development in Adult Education," in Handbook of Adult Education in the United States, ed. by Malcolm S. Knowles (Chicago: Adult Education Association of the USA, 1960), p. 67.

to involve all potential learners in all phases of the program planning process. However, few would disagree that

There is practically unanimous agreement in all studies that the maximum (feasible) involvement of potential and actual constituents in program building produces the best results.⁵

Welden stresses the positive benefits of conferee participation in conference program planning. "Participant representation in program planning for conferences enables the adult educator to develop more effective learning situations than would otherwise be possible."⁶ Bruner et al. stress the effectiveness of committees in program planning for adult education.

The use of advisory committees in program planning . . . is one of the most nearly universal procedures practiced by adult education agencies. Schools, libraries, community colleges, the Cooperative Extension Service and many voluntary agencies all employ it to a greater or lesser extent. It is frequently an effective device for insuring a more democratic participation in program building than would otherwise occur.⁷

This study sought to discover if the active participation of conference constituents as members of various conference committees, did, in fact, produce results that were different from the results obtained from those constituents who participated to a lesser degree.

⁵Edmund deS. Brunner and Associates, An Overview of Adult Education Research (Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of the USA, 1967), p. 99.

⁶J. Eugene Welden, "Program Planning and Program Effectiveness in University Residential Centers" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1966).

⁷Brunner and Associates, p. 133.

Review of the Literature

In a cursory analysis of the concept participation, one finds that in a democratic society, such as ours is purported to be, a great deal of divergence exists in the attempts to define participatory democracy. Participation by all citizens in all walks of life, in all activities which concern the citizen as a member of a viable society has been a source for debate.

Definitive statements concerning citizen participation begin with the Oxford Universal Dictionary. The definition of citizen contains the nouns inhabitant, member, and native. The definition of participation contains the verbs partaking and sharing, as well as the verb phrase (participle phrase) taking part in some action or matter. Citizen participation can, therefore, be defined as being a process in which a member (of a community) takes an active part. The definition infers an action process, by an individual, in partnership with all others in a group. Spiegel, has written, "Citizen participation is the process that can meaningfully tie programs to people."⁸ Goldblatt has posited citizen participation as being, ". . . a wide variety of specific activities by a variety of persons occupying different status positions in the city."⁹ Zurcher

⁸Hans B. C. Spiegel (ed.), Citizen Participation in Urban Development (Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968), p. 11.

⁹Harold Goldblatt, "Arguments for and Against

describes the sentiment of a Mr. G. as being, ". . . you've got to get involved and take an active part and you've got to get together in a group. . . ."10

Each of the aforementioned has described citizen participation as being an action oriented process involving people or members of a group (community). Each implicitly and/or explicitly defines citizen participation in accordance with this writer's extrapolation from the Oxford Dictionary, which becomes programmatic. Such a programmatic meaning or definition is, ". . . a definition which tells us overtly or implicitly that this is the way things should be."11 Adult educators have also defined citizen participation in democratic institutions as being an on-going action process. Bruner et al. have written that

. . . social (citizen) participation is defined as interaction with others in a socially defined relationship wherein the roles of those participating are more or less structured and mutually understood.12

Others seem to posit a more nebulous though meaningful definition. Wilson writes that, "Citizen participation is not an end in itself, but a means to other ends."13

Citizen Participation in Urban Renewal," in Spiegel, op.cit., p. 32.

¹⁰Louis A. Zurcher, "Selection of Indigenous Leadership," Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. 76 (1967), p. 31.

¹¹Jonas F. Soltis, An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts (Boston: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1968), p. 5.

¹²Brunner and Associates, p. 99.

¹³James Q. Wilson, "The Citizen in the Renewal Process," Journal of Housing, Vol. 29 (1963), p. 627.

A federal agency definition (HUD) also conceives it as a means.¹⁴ Neither Wilson nor HUD, at this point, consider the qualitative aspects of the decision to encourage citizen participation. Both assume the inherent goodness or desirability of participation per se. There is a position, however, which reasons that participation is not a means but an end itself. The quality of goodness remains implied. Edgar and Jean Cahn reason that "participation means participation." This may appear to be somewhat circular, however, when understood in the context of the entire thought, participation can be viewed as an end in itself. They have written

Citizen participation does not mean the illusion of participation, the semblance of involvement, the opportunity to speak without being heard, the receipt of token benefits, or the enjoyment of stop-gap palliative measures. Participation means participation in every dimension of life, of culture, or of our economy, our educational system, our political system, our decision making processes. It means full enfranchisement with respect to the totality of society's activities.¹⁵

There are also those who would not define citizen participation as any of the aforementioned. One Federal Act states that it is "... the constructive involvement

¹⁴Program Guide No. 7, Workable Program for Community Improvement--Answers on Citizen Participation (Washington, D.C.: Housing and Urban Development, Feb., 1966).

¹⁵Edgar S. and Jean Camper Cahn, "Citizen Participation," in Spiegel, op. cit., p. 223.

of citizens . . . in planning and carrying out the program."¹⁶ Such a definition can only be classed as value laden and inappropriate as a definition in a broad sense. Lash has said, "Citizen participation means pushing officials for services."¹⁷

Citizen participation has also been classified as lobbying. Doyle calls it a pressure group.¹⁸ The latter two, Lash and Doyle, for the purposes of this study, cannot be classified as definers, however, both stated what they meant by citizen participation and should be included as descriptive statements of what might be. Disagreement has been shown to exist concerning what citizen participation is. This writer postulates a simple, almost naive question, What is citizen participation? The question being one of two issues to deal with. The second issue is deemed to be the question, "Should citizens be encouraged or allowed to participate?" If one answers in the affirmative to this, there remains two further points to raise. First, why should citizens be allowed or encouraged, and second, how can they as individuals or groups take part in the process? If one answers in the negative--"citizens should not be allowed or encouraged," the question, "Why not?" remains. Writers such as Seaver as well as Edgar and Jean Cahn do

¹⁶Program Guide No. 7, op. cit.

¹⁷Goldblatt, op. cit., p. 34.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 38.

not raise issues concerning the desirability of citizen participation. They assume the principle to be valid. Seaver has written, ". . . citizen participation in the broad sense . . . is taken for granted. . . ."19 The Cahn's philosophical outlook is made most clear in their statement of beliefs, ". . . we believe that the citizen--rich or poor--can make a rational and informed decision in allocating resources among competing priorities and competing demands. . . ."20 Alinsky also leaves no room to question the desirability of citizen participation. "The building of a people's organization can be done only by the people themselves."21 There are others, though, who raise interesting points which become questions about the desirability of a government permitting citizens to participate. Not all would agree with Goldblatt that, "Citizen participation is considered to be nothing less than democratic procedure. . . ."22

Doyle and others imply that citizen participation is dysfunctional

¹⁹Robert C. Seaver, "The Dilemma of Citizen Participation," in Spiegel, op. cit., p. 61.

²⁰Cahn, op. cit., p. 213.

²¹Saul Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), p. 87.

²²Goldblatt, op. cit., p. 35.

Citizen participation is, in effect, a splinter group instead of a city-wide effort. Because it is local it perceives renewal in local terms; it is a pressure group, a lobby for local vested interests as opposed to the interests of the total community. . . . The philosophy of city officials, on the other hand, is equal treatment of every section of the community.²³

Wilson also addresses himself to the possible dysfunctional aspects of citizen participation

It is not yet clear, however, whether such neighborhood groups will provide a means whereby citizens overcome their "alienation" or whether they simply provide a forum in which citizens can give expression to it. These groups after all, are usually concerned about neighborhood, not city-wide problems. . . .²⁴

Crain and Rosenthal conclude an article with the statement

If public officials are going to do the right thing, the people should leave them alone while they do it.²⁵

Several others have addressed themselves to the point that participation should be limited. Edelston and Kolondner point out what appears to be some hypocrisy in at least one Federal Agency.

While professing that the concept extends to planning of programs as well as to their implementation, the OEO has produced in Washington major prepackaged programs which have apparently been conceived and planned by technicians alone.²⁶

²³Ibid., p. 38.

²⁴James Q. Wilson, "Planning and Politics," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 29 (November, 1963), p. 248.

²⁵Robert L. Grain and Donald B. Rosenthal, "Community Status as a Dimension of Local Decision Making," American Sociological Review, Vol. 32 (1967), p. 984.

²⁶Harold C. Edelston and Ferne K. Kolondner, "Are

If true, it appears that the OEO is operating contrary to the intent of Section 201 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which states

The term "community action program" means a program . . . which is developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served.

One must ponder the possibility that at least some of the bureaucrats in OEO do not really believe that citizens should be involved in planning.

Edelston and Kolondner also write of their own experiences. Although they warn the reader ". . . that a single experience cannot lay claim to an outcome which has broad implications for universal application,"²⁷ they infer a generalization from what is not demonstrably much more than a single experience when they write

The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from our experience is that the road to reaching its stated objectives is strewn with practical obstacles. The first obstacle is the apathetic response of poor people to the opportunity to participate in an activity which, at least until the implementation stage is reached, is primarily an intellectual exercise in problem solving. It raises the issue of whether the very attempt to promote their participation does not represent the imposition of the patronizing, paternalistic approach which the concept of "maximum feasible participation" is intended to eradicate. Our experience produced no evidence that the poor are consumed with desire to partake of planning. Prior claims by local civil rights leaders to the contrary were not borne

the Poor Capable of Planning for Themselves?" in Spiegel, op. cit., p. 225.

²⁷Spiegel, op. cit., p. 226.

out by the response to the efforts to organize a planning group representative of Action Area residents.²⁸

Crain and Rosenthal also raise questions about the desirability of citizen participation. From their studies they hypothesize

that a city with a well educated population is partly immobilized by high levels of citizen participation which prevent the government from exercising the authority to make decisions. Citizen participation in the planning process means more opposition, more issues to be negotiated with, more people, more chance of failure.²⁹

The issue, should citizens participate, appears to be a philosophical question. If one decides that people should be involved in the political process, the decision is usually arrived at through some analysis of a personal belief system. If, on the other hand, one determines that the involvement of people in some action which has direct or indirect implications for them should in some way be limited, the decision appears to be made based on what has apparently been some unsuccessful participatory experience.

Thus far an attempt has been made to demonstrate the reasoning concerning the questions; Should citizens participate?, If so, why?, and If not, why not?. There remains one issue (point) to analyze: How can individuals take part in the process of citizen participation?

²⁸Ibid., p. 231.

²⁹Crain and Rosenthal, op. cit., p. 984.

It has been reasoned that, in the process of attempting to develop a democratic participatory society, institutions and social groups have weaned themselves from highly autocratic leadership patterns and have usually structured one of two social styles

They have selected a paternalistic or father-substitute kind of leadership, trusting the leader to make various kinds of decisions, in the trust that he will do things for the good of the group. Another tendency has been completely to reject leadership in the traditional sense and to substitute a kind of permissive, leaderless, controlless group.³⁰

However, there appears to be an area of centrality between the aforementioned which develops it into a continuum from a great deal of leadership to little or no leadership. Bellamy has reasoned that "In true citizen participation there would be a dialogue between planners and representatives of the residents."³¹ This position appears to posit that people should elect (appoint) representatives to talk for them. Some similarity seems to exist between Bellamy's method and some forms of representative government. Rossi and Dentler have analyzed the role Bellamy's residents would play or how they would play it. The ". . . maximum role to be played by a citizen participation movement in urban renewal is primarily a passive one."³²

³⁰J. R. Gibb, Grace N. Platts, and Lorraine F. Miller, Dynamics of Participative Groups (Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1951), p. 20.

³¹Spiegel, op. cit., p. 39.

³²Peter H. Rossi and Robert A. Dentler, The Politics

Zurcher has shown how institutionalization creeps into a participatory activity among people who normally do not have a great deal of institutional structure. Those who form participatory groups ". . . should think about electing a chairman, a vice-chairman, and a secretary. . . ."33

Sherrard and Murray discuss several ways in which citizens participate. Among them are picketing, boycotts, rent strikes, and sit-ins.³⁴ The Cahns have reasoned that citizen participation should be orderly dialogue and negotiation. Their statement is extremely interesting and enlightening in that if citizen participation is not real, genuine, meaningful, and total, then, ". . . citizen participation takes on another and more sinister meaning [method]: civil disorder. The participants term it rebellion."³⁵

HUD has published a how-to-do-it pamphlet and has outlined how citizens will participate. There are five approved ways an individual may take part in the keystone of a community's "Workable Program."

1. inform themselves of their community's activities-in-progress and contemplated--and the needs for improvement with respect to planning, code adoption and enforcement, housing, public facilities, urban renewal and other Workable Program activities;

of Urban Renewal--The Chicago Findings (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 287.

³³Zurcher, op. cit., p. 31.

³⁴Thomas D. Sherrard and Richard C. Murray, "The Church and Neighborhood Community Organization," Social Work, Vol. 10, No. 3 (July, 1965).

³⁵Cahn, op. cit., p. 222.

2. assist in developing objectives and goals for improvement;
3. inventory the community resources--public and private, present or needed--for accomplishing these objectives;
4. learn and pursue the methods and means for achieving the determined goals for improvements; and
5. serve as the medium for bringing private resources into the Program.³⁶

Some of those who have involved themselves in an analysis of participatory democracy have determined that

participative action groups choose as one of their first activities a discussion of their goals; they decide why they have met, what activities they wish to engage in, what they wish the final outcome to be. This goal-forming, activity-choosing, activity-evaluating sequence is the factor which defines a participative group. If the group does this properly, many of the other characteristics of participativeness will follow.³⁷

The very essence of democratic patterns of living is spontaneity, flexibility and change . . . all the preplanning must provide for an atmosphere in which members can set goals and continually modify these goals as new needs are seen.³⁸

Such patterns of living in democratic participatory social groups is not unlike that which educators have said is an appropriate life style for those who are involved in the educational process as designers of curricula, teachers, and learners. Bruner, in discussing a total curriculum as well as the design of a particular portion of the total

³⁶Program Guide No. 7, op. cit.

³⁷Gibb, Platts, Miller, op. cit., p. 22.

³⁸Ibid., p. 25.

curriculum, has written that goals must be clear and measurable. He further states that a knowledge of the results of an educational experience is the essence in the development or acquisition of skills.

There is a very crucial matter about acquiring a skill--be it chess, political savy, biology, or skiing. The goal must be plain; one must have a sense of where one is trying to get to in any given instance of activity. For the exercise of skill is governed by an intention and feedback on the relation between what one has intended and what one has achieved thus far--"knowledge of results." Without it, the generativeness of skilled operations is lost. What this means in the formal educational setting is far more emphasis on making clear the purpose of every exercise, every lesson plan, every unit, every term, every education. If this is to be achieved, then plainly there will have to be much more participatory democracy in the formulation of lessons, curricula, courses of study, and the rest. For surely the participation of the learner in setting goals is one of the few ways of making clear where the learner is trying to get to.³⁹

However, not all would agree with Bruner. There are those who do not believe participatory democracy to be functional in an educational setting. Nisbet has written

the campus has become a microcosm of the national and international scene in the number and intensity of ideological issues it has assimilated during the past two decades. And finally, no one can miss the extent to which "participatory democracy" in university affairs has created a setting of instant and chronic politics that increasingly makes serious teaching and study impossible.⁴⁰

³⁹Jerome Bruner, "The Skill of Relevance or the Relevance of Skills," Saturday Review (April 18, 1970), p. 68.

⁴⁰Robert A. Nisbet, "The University Had Better Mind Its Own Business," Psychology Today, Vol. 4, No. 10 (March, 1971), p. 31.

This writer's philosophical bent precludes agreement with those such as Nisbet. Bruner and others, most specifically adult educators, have articulated a position acceptable to those who believe in participatory democracy.

As Schroeder has written

Some authors emphasize the individual, some the society. Those who emphasize individual needs as a basis for goal formulation usually justify their positions either by pointing out that such an emphasis is the essence of democracy or that if the needs of the individual are satisfied, then the needs of society will also be satisfied.⁴¹

Verner, Liveright and Jensen have written of the adult learner as one who is actively engaged in determining the structure of educational experiences.

In response to these differences, adult education has developed a basic method of teaching-learning which involves the learners actively in assessing his needs, formulating educational objectives, designing and conducting learning activities, and evaluating outcome.⁴²

Hallenbeck also emphasizes the action orientation of adult education with the statement that

Adult education is best employed, most educators believe, when people are aided in obtaining the facts required by the specific problem, assisted in considering all sides of the question and the various alternatives available, urged to make their own decisions and to involve themselves in action to bring about the changes desired.⁴³

⁴¹Wayne L. Schroeder, "Adult Education Defined and Described," in *Handbook of Adult Education*, ed. by Robert M. Smith, George F. Aker and J. R. Kidd (New York: Macmillan Co., 1970), p. 33.

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. vii.

⁴³Wilbur C. Hallenbeck, "The Role of Adult Education

One way that a democratic participatory process can be institutionalized is through the formation of representative groups. Historically, many representative social groups have been formalized into committees.

After all, the committee is an Anglo-Saxon product. It grew up with other Anglo-Saxon forms. It was one of the earliest, if not the earliest, representative social form. It became thoroughly incorporated not only in our legal and governmental system but in our voluntary social system very early in the history of the English speaking people. We have now in Congress, in our voluntary groups, and in our jury system, a thorough-going series of committees which actually do, I presume, control our lives. If we knew where most of the authority in American life was generated, I presume we should discover it was in committees of one sort or another.⁴⁴

Others have also posited the institutionalization of committees. Fauber and Laue have written that

It is through committees that citizens carry on democracy's day to day business. Committees are the working arms of organizations. They are the means by which we are able to do things along with our neighbors, our fellow-citizens, fellow-church members, fellow-workers, fellow-parents, fellow-voters, fellow-farmers or executives or labor leaders or doctors or school administrators. We carry on much of the business of government and the business of business, as well as the business of voluntary organizations, through committees.⁴⁵

in Society," Psychology Today, Vol. 4, No. 10 (March, 1971), p. 9.

⁴⁴E. C. Lindeman, "The Authorities, Functions and Limitations of Committees," in Committees: Their Purposes, Functions and Administration by John J. Pader and E. C. Lindemann (New York: American Management Association), p. 11.

⁴⁵Julia Cole Fauber and Gilbert Laue, "Building Committees," Adult Leadership, Vol. 2, No. 4 (September, 1953), p. 14.

Although the functions of committees are an important part of any democratic organization, they are not conceived of as participating at every level of decision making. However, a large part of the work-a-day organizational activities can best be performed by the democratic device known as a committee.

Any organization is going to have a great deal of work to do if it is to accomplish its purpose. Some of the work can be done by individuals, some of it can and must be done by the organization as a whole. The rest of it must be done by small working groups of individuals. Since the bulk of the work cannot be done by the total organization and should not be done by a single individual, the committee is not only the most democratic device we have but it is the most practical as well.⁴⁶

Committees not only permeate American life during the citizens years of adulthood, but such a participatory process is pervasive in all age groups.

From elementary school age on through the mature years, the individual in our democratic society is increasingly called upon to take his place along side of other people on committees.⁴⁷

The participatory process provided by committees structured for adult conference program planning can be considered an action process. In the planning of a conference the conference director "should have the active assistance of a conference committee representative of the persons or

⁴⁶A. R. Trecker and H. B. Trecker, Committee Common Sense (New York: Whiteside, Inc. and William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1954), p. 6.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 12.

groups who are to attend. . . ."48 It has also been written that a conference director should not only seek the active assistance of conference participants as members of advisory committees but "should be ready to be influenced by committee findings."49 However, the influence of selected committees should not be related to its numerical size. "A committee may consist of any number of persons. Usually they range in size anywhere from one to twenty with three, five, or seven being the most frequently used number."50 "The ideal size for a committee depends on its functions."51

It has been posited that a conference committee's influence should be based on its function. "If it is a committee of directors quite naturally its functions will be different from those of a committee of management. . . ."52 A conference director, who appoints committees to assist him, should provide clear and concise guidelines within which such committees function. "Usually the committee is charged with a very specific responsibility, which determines the purpose of its meeting."53

⁴⁸William Utterback, Group Thinking and Conference Leadership (Rev. ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 159.

⁴⁹Trecker and Trecker, op. cit., p. 45.

⁵⁰James A. McMonagle and Emil R. Pfister, The Membership Manual (New York: Vantage Press, 1970), p. 104.

⁵¹Fauber and Laue, op. cit., p. 15.

⁵²Lindemann, op. cit., p. 16.

⁵³Harold P. Zelko, Successful Conference and Discussion Techniques (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1957), p. 53.

When several conference committees are operationalized, the function of each committee is determined in part by its status. "Organizations differ in the extent to which cues are provided occupants of various positions making it easy to identify their status."⁵⁴ Such cues or symbols can be committee titles which reflect differing functions. Those responsible for formulating conference committee structures can, by publicly charging committee members, influence the status and esteem of such members. "Many live in a symbolic environment . . . and can be stimulated to act by symbols. . . ."⁵⁵ It can, therefore, be hypothesized that committees whose functions are delineated by a hierarchy of increasing responsibility will be seen as committees with a hierarchical order of status and esteem.

The status of a conference committee, as perceived by conferees assigned to other committees as well as conferees not assigned committee responsibility, directly affects each committee member. Cooley has written of the "reflected or looking glass self,"⁵⁶ which is the theory that we tend to see ourselves as others see us. Such reasoning is in agreement with that of Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachy

⁵⁴Bass, op. cit., p. 267.

⁵⁵Rose, op. cit., p. 5.

⁵⁶Theodore M. Newcomb, Ralph H. Turner, and Phillip E. Converse, Social Psychology: The Study of Human Interaction (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1965), p. 142.

Balance theory asserts that unbalanced . . . systems tend to shift toward a state of balance. . . . For social psychology, the most significant application of balance theory is concerned with the individual's affective cognitions pertaining to people and social objects; that is, the person's own positive or negative evaluation of people and objects, and his cognition of the positive and negative evaluative relations that exist among people and objects.⁵⁷

If others see us as maintaining a certain status, we will see ourselves in that status position.

It is, therefore, hypothesized that several operationalized conference committees whose members are looked upon, by other conferees, as maintaining a certain status will look upon themselves in the same light. "It is thus the confirming responses of other people that provide support for perspectives."⁵⁸

Anderson, Mawly, Miller, and Olson have written that "There is a strong relationship between the individual's self-perception of his academic and occupational abilities and his achievement in these areas."⁵⁹ If, therefore, there is a relationship between how others see us and the way we

⁵⁷David Krech, Richard Crutchfield, and Egerton L. Ballachey, Individual in Society (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962), p. 41.

⁵⁸Shibutani Tomotsu, "Reference Groups as Perspectives," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 60 (1955), pp. 562-570.

⁵⁹Robert C. Anderson, Russell G. Mawly, Joe A. Miller, and Andrew L. Olson, "Parental Aspirations," Adult Leadership, Vol. 14 (May 1965), p. 10.

see ourselves and we see ourselves as being responsible for certain conference committee functions, we should perform such responsibilities expeditiously.

Summary

In summary, one can find sufficient evidence to support a philosophical view concerning the participation of citizens in a social system. One can reason that participation is inherently bad or inherently good. However, adult educators have, in the main, assumed the inherent goodness of the participatory process.

A way to institutionalize democratic social participation in adult education is through the formulation of advisory committees. Such advisory committees can serve in various levels of the educational milieu. More specifically advisory committees can function in conferences structured to deal with the adult in contemporary society.

It can also be reasoned that the perceived influence of operationalized conference committees is in relation to the function and responsibility assigned. If one is perceived by others as maintaining a high status positional level, one will bring one's self perception in balance with the perception of others. Such a self perception will positively affect one's ability and achievement.

Hypotheses Derived from the Literature

It has been posited that participation of adults in the various social systems which affect their day-by-day

lives is inherently good. More specifically, adults should be encouraged to participate in the total educational environment. The thrust of this study was to assess the results of the active participation of conferees as members of conference committees. Such committees were assigned dissimilar functions at different points in time as explained in Chapter II. Three general hypotheses with associated sub-hypotheses were tested. The first general hypothesis and associated sub-hypotheses are:

H1: Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will perceive the effectiveness of the conference differently.

Sub-hypotheses in null form are:

H1s1: There are no differences in satisfaction of the learning experience among committees who varied in levels of participation.

H1s2: There are no differences in values held among committees who varied in levels of participation.

H1s3: There are no differences in the achievement of values among committees who varied in levels of participation.

The second general hypothesis and associated sub-hypotheses are:

H2: Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will

be perceived as having different amounts of influence.

Sub-hypotheses in null form are:

- H2s1: There are no differences in perception of those that are most influential among committees who varied in their level of participation.
- H2s2: There are no differences in perception of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s3: There are no differences in perception of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s4: There are no differences in perception of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s5: There are no differences in perceived desire to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s6: There are no differences in perceived desire to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

The third general hypothesis and associated sub-hypotheses are:

- H3: Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will

be perceived as having different amounts of influence at different times throughout the conference.

Sub-hypotheses in null form are:

- H3s1: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that are most influential among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s2: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s3: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s4: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s5: There are no differences in perceived desire at different times, to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s6: There are no differences in perceived desire, at different times, to consult with members of

committees that varied in their level of participation.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the methods used for conducting the study. The methodology is divided into three parts: (1) selection of participants; (2) determination of committee structure and function; (3) selection of learning groups and committees; and, (4) data collection, reduction and analysis.

Selection of Participants

The population used for this study was comprised of all those who participated in the Florida Institute for Correctional Educators. The Institute (conference) was held in Tallahassee, Florida from the seventeenth of May 1971 through the fourth of June 1971. The project was sponsored jointly by the Florida Division of Corrections, the Florida Board of Regents and the Florida State University Department of Adult Education. This writer was appointed project director by the head of the Department of Adult Education.

Participants were selected by the Florida Division of Corrections from the several correctional institutions

in the state. The number from each institution was determined by the size of an institution's educational program as compared with the size of the total state correctional education effort. The institutions represented and the number of participants from each were as follows: Apalachee Correctional Institution (8), Avon Park Correctional Institution (4), DeSoto Correctional Institution (2), Florida Correctional Institution (7), Florida State Prison (10), Glades Correctional Institution (4), Road Prison (1), Sumter Correctional Institution (14). The total number of conference participants, used for this study, was fifty. (One participant was not included in the total, since his job description was not that of teacher.)

Determination of Committee Structure and Function

To probe into the effect of various levels of conferee participation in program planning, a methodological design was formulated to assign conference participants to committees that were given different levels of responsibility in the planning and implementation of the conference. A programmatic definition for the concept committee, used for the purposes of this study was,

A committee may be defined as a group of persons limited in membership by selective appointment, usually appointed by some superior authority, and having joint responsibility for inquiry, deliberation, decision,

action, sponsorship, or related activities in regard to matters assigned to them.¹

The nomenclature used for the various conference committees, arranged in order of decreasing responsibility was: the Planning Committee, the Steering Committee and the Feedback Committee. A residual group, composed of conferees not assigned to these three committees became the experimental Control Group. The Control Group was designated the lowest in potential influence since no specific responsibilities were assigned to it.

The Planning Committee was composed of ten persons, six of whom became conference participants, selected by the Florida Division of Corrections to work with the conference director in making decisions regarding the policy to guide the conference. Such policy decisions concerned the general content of the conference. More specifically, the function of the Planning Committee was to determine, prior to the start of the conference, substantive subject matter deemed most appropriate for inclusion in the conference program.

The conference director held two pre-conference planning sessions with the Planning Committee. During these sessions this committee identified the subject matter and the amount of time to be devoted to each as follows: how institutional change is brought about (40%),

¹Arthur Dunham, Community Welfare Organization (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958), p. 390.

counselling techniques (20%), inmate resocialization (20%), and instructional techniques (20%). The Planning Committee also suggested a number of methodological considerations to the conference director. Among these was that some time be provided for a dialogue between conferees and available custodial staff as well as inmates. Upon establishing operational policy and identifying substantive subject matter this committee ceased to function, however, their contributions to the pre-conference planning were made known to all conference participants. An example of their participation can be found in Appendix A.

The Steering Committee was structured to be the second most influential committee. This committee, selected as described in the next section of the chapter, was composed of five members. They operated under the broad policy guidelines set by the Planning Committee and made, after the start of the conference, day-by-day operational decisions. At various points in time during the conference, the Steering Committee met and evaluated the Planning Committees policy decisions. The Steering Committee suggested to the conference director conference content not formalized by the Planning Committee. As a result of operational decisions arrived at by all Steering Committee members, the conference director added to the conference program such things as participant discussions with administrators from the central office, selected custodial personnel, selected inmates and other

appropriate program inclusions. An example of the Steering Committee's participation can be found in Appendix B.

The Feedback Committee was composed of five subcommittees of three members each. They were selected as described in the next section of this chapter. It was structured to be the least influential committee functioning during this conference. Members were conferees not directly involved in the making of policy or operational decisions. Their function was to provide specific inputs to be used by the Steering Committee in the formulation of operational decisions. More specifically, the Feedback Committee's function was to indirectly influence each Steering Committee member's operational decisions through suggesting program inclusions for consideration by the Steering Committee and by the conference director.

All conferees not directly or indirectly involved in making policy or operational decisions were considered as the Control Group.

Selection of Learning Groups and Committees

At the start of the conference five learning groups with ten participants in each were formed. Planning Committee members attending the conference were assigned to each of the learning groups on a random basis so that at least one and no more than two would be in any given learning group. Since five learning groups were formed

and there were six members of the Planning Committee, one learning group had two Planning Committee members assigned. Of the learning group members who had not been on the Planning Committee, one was randomly selected from each group to serve on the Steering Committee. The Feedback Committee, as previously mentioned, was in actuality, five separate Feedback Committees, one in each learning group. Each of the five committees was composed of three randomly selected members from each learning group and not assigned to either of the other two committees. As described earlier, their function was to provide information and feedback to their Steering Committee member for his consideration in day-to-day conference decision making. The Steering Committee member who was to receive their input may or may not have had brief conferences with those responsible to give feedback.

A schema portraying the distribution of committee members in the several learning groups is found in Table 1.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS FOR EACH
LEARNING GROUP

Committee	Learning Groups				
	1	2	3	4	5
Planning	1	1	1	1	2
Steering	1	1	1	1	1
Feedback	3	3	3	3	3
Control	5	5	5	5	5
n =	10	10	10	10	10

Data Collection, Reduction
and Analysis

An educational conference evaluation form developed by Eugene Welden, at the University of Chicago, was used to collect the data which attempted to assess conferee ascribed conference effectiveness. A copy of this instrument can be found in Appendix C. This instrument, as used, contained four sub-parts: Satisfaction, Importance of Values to Individual, Achievement of Values, Additional Information. After receiving the evaluation form, on the last day of the conference, each conferee was asked to note on the front sheet his committee function. Those forms with no notation were placed in the Control Group.

These data were scored in the following way: The first part of the Welden Scale contained the variable Satisfaction which was composed of thirty statements. One-half (fifteen) of the statements were positive and one-half were negative. The respondents were requested to circle a number, one through five, for each of the thirty statements. An example of these statements is as follows:

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Un-</u> <u>decided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
The purposes of this program were clear to me	5	4	3	2	1
The objectives of this program were not realistic	5	4	3	2	1

For purposes of ease in responding to each statement, all positive statements were ranked from five, Strongly Agree, to one, Strongly Disagree. The negative statements were reversed with a weight of one being awarded to Strongly Agree and a weight of five awarded to Strongly Disagree.

An example of the scoring is as follows:

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Un-</u> <u>decided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
The purposes of this program were clear to me	5	4	3	2	1
The objectives of this program were not realistic	1	2	3	4	5

The next two parts of the Welden Scale contain the variables, Importance of Selected Values and degree to which the conference helped in the Achievement of Selected Values. Each of these variables contained twenty-four statements. Under Selected Values the respondents were asked to circle one number for each statement ranging from a four, Very Important, to one, Unimportant. An example of these statements is as follows:

	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Slightly</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Unim-</u> <u>portant</u>
Increasing effectiveness in my chosen profession is	4	3	2	1

Under the part of the Welden Scale dealing with Achievement of Values a parallel statement was responded to.

The respondents were asked to circle one number for each statement ranging from a four, Very Well, to one, Not at All. An example of these statements is as follows:

	<u>Very</u> <u>Well</u>	<u>Well</u>	<u>Fairly</u> <u>Well</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>at All</u>
(This conference) Increased effectiveness in my chosen profession	4	3	2	1

The data were coded onto IBM cards and analyzed by the Florida State University, Mathematics Computer Facility. Satisfaction, Selected Values, and Achievement of Values were analyzed on the BMD01V (Analysis of Variance for One-Way Design-Version of May 4, 1965 Health Sciences Computing Facility) UCLA. The Additional Information section was used to collect data on the demographic attributes age, education, number of conferences attended and sex. The data was run on the BMD01D (Simple Data Description Version of May 20, 1964 Health Sciences Computing Facility) UCLA.

Conferee perceived influence was determined by analyzing a sociometric test developed specifically for the Florida Institute for Correctional Educators (see Appendix D). The instrument was derived from classic sociometric techniques in cooperation with Irwin Jahns and G. Ray Worley, both of the Department of Adult Education, Florida State University. The instrument was used to collect data on six perceived characteristics: A. Most Influential, B. Best Ideas, C. Participated the Most, D. Most Positive

Influence, E. Informal Conversations, and F. Like to Consult. This sociometric instrument was administered four times during the conference; at the end of the first week, at the end of the second week, in the middle of the third week and at the end of the third week.

These data were collected and analyzed in the following manner: the conference participants were divided into five learning groups. Each learning group had ten members. A group member's name was placed on only those instruments which were scored by other members of his group. The participants were asked to rank order three group members, excluding himself, either 1, 2, or 3 for six characteristics as follows:

- A. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have been most influential in your group discussions.
- B. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have had the best ideas during the group discussions.
- C. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have participated the most in your group discussions.
- D. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have exerted the most positive influence in directing your group discussion.

- E. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people with whom you would like to have informal conversations.
- F. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people with whom you would like to consult about the content and procedures used in the institute.

After an administration, a group member's total ranking for each characteristic was determined. Since a ranking of 1 denoted a higher order than a ranking of 2 and 2 a higher order than 3, an inverse multiplier was used to determine the total. The number of 1 rankings was multiplied by 3, the number of 2 rankings was multiplied by 2, and the number of 3 rankings was multiplied by 1. All of the products were then added to obtain a total score and divided by the number of group members scoring. For example, if on the first test for the first characteristic, a conferee was given two ranks of 1, three ranks of 2 and one rank of 3, the total would be 13, with a mean score of 2.17 or 31 divided by 6. The mean scores derived for all members of each participant group were added, then divided by the number of group members. Because of the multiplier effect, an inverse relationship among rankings of 1, 2 and 3 exists. The closer a mean score is to 1, the lower it was considered. The data were punched on IBM cards and a one way analysis of variance was used to determine

differences among participant groups for each of the six characteristics.² The data were analyzed and significance determined for each characteristic for all participant groups on each test. The data were analyzed by the Florida State University Mathematics Computer Facility on the BMD01V (Analysis of Variance for One-Way Design-Version of May 4, 1965 Health Sciences Computing Facility) UCLA.

An analysis was also performed to determine significance of the effects of time on perceptions held toward each participant group. All participant groups were analyzed for all characteristics for each sociometric test. The data were run on BMD02V (Analysis of Variance for Factorial Design-Version of July 22, 1965 Health Sciences Computing Facility) UCLA.

²BMD01V - Analysis of Variance for One-Way Design-Version of May 4, 1965 Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter is presented in three parts. First, the demographic attributes of the study population are presented and analyzed. Second, data concerning conferee attitudes toward the Florida Institute for Correctional Educators is presented and analyzed. Finally, an analysis of conferee perception of the influence held by each committee and the control group is presented.

Demographic Attributes

In an effort to determine the attributes of the conferees attending the Institute for Correctional Educators, data on the variables age, sex, number of conferences attended and education were collected. These data were then used to develop profiles of the attributes of each participant group. These data are presented in Table 2.

Since the Planning Committee was appointed by the Florida Division of Corrections prior to the selection of all other conference participants, it could not be assumed that the Planning Committee was demographically representative of those educators attending the conference. Analysis

TABLE 2

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN
THE FLORIDA INSTITUTE FOR CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

Characteristic	Planning Committee		Steering Committee		Feedback Committee		Control Group		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Age										
21-35	2	33	3	60	10	66	13	54	28	56
36-55	3	50	1	20	4	27	11	46	19	38
55-plus	1	17	1	20	1	7			3	6
Education										
High School							1	4	1	2
Some College					1	7	1	4	2	4
Baccalaureate			3	60	4	27	6	25	14	28
Grad. Study	6	100	2	40	10	66	16	67	33	66
Number of Conferences Attended										
None	1	17	3	60	9	60	14	59	27	54
1	2	33	1	20	2	13	3	12.5	8	16
2	2	33			3	20	3	12.5	8	16
3					1	7	2	8	3	6
4			1	20					1	2
5							1	4	1	2
6	1	17							1	2
7 or more							1	4	1	2
Sex										
Male	3	50	5	100	14	93	22	92	44	88
Female	3	50			1	7	2	8	6	12

of the demographic data confirmed that the Planning Committee did have a different demographic profile than all other participant groups.

Age

Analyzing the variable age, it was found that 56 percent of the conferees were in the age group 21-35, 38 percent were in the age group 36-55 and 6 percent were over 55 years of age. The Steering Committee, Feedback Committee and the Control Group each had a roughly similar profile. However, of the Planning Committee members, 33 percent were 21-35, 50 percent were 36-55 and 17 percent were over 55 years of age.

Education

Analyzing the variable education, it was found that 6 percent of the conferees had less than a baccalaureate degree, 28 percent had a baccalaureate degree and 66 percent were involved in graduate study. The Feedback Committee and the Control Group each had a similar profile, while of the Steering Committee members, 60 percent had a baccalaureate degree and 40 percent were involved in graduate study. However, 100 percent of the members of the Planning Committee were involved in graduate study.

Number of Conferences Attended

Analyzing the variable, number of conferences attended, it was found that 54 percent of the conferees had attended no other conferences while 32 percent had attended one or two other conferences and 14 percent had attended more than three conferences. The Control Group

had a similar profile. The Steering Committee and the Feedback Committee were essentially similar to each other. Sixty percent of the Steering Committee had not attended any other conference, 20 percent had attended one and 20 percent attended four other conferences. Of the Feedback Committee members 60 percent had not attended any other conference while 13 percent had attended one, 20 percent had attended two and 7 percent had attended three other conferences. Seventeen percent of the Planning Committee members had not attended any other conference, while 33 percent had attended one, 33 percent had attended two and 17 percent had attended six other conferences.

Sex

In analyzing the variable sex it was found that 88 percent of the conferees were males and 12 percent females. The Control Group was 92 percent male and 8 percent female, while the Feedback Committee was 93 percent male and 7 percent female. All of the Steering Committee members were male. The Planning Committee was equally divided between the sexes (50 percent male and 50 percent female).

Summary of Demographic Attributes

Analyzing the variable age, it was found that approximately two-thirds of the Planning Committee were in the 36-55 age group while a majority of the members of all other participant groups were in the 21-35 age group. An

analysis of the variable education shows that all of the members of the Planning Committee were involved in graduate study, while a majority of the Steering Committee were not. It was found that while a majority of the Feedback Committee, the Control Group and the conferees as a whole were involved in graduate study, some of the members were without a baccalaureate degree. The variable, number of conferences attended, shows that while most of the Planning Committee had attended one or two conferences, most of the members of all other participant groups had not attended any other conference. In analyzing the variable sex, it was found that one-half of the Planning Committee were females while all members of the Steering Committee were males. Males also comprised a majority of the members of all other participant groups.

A perusal of the demographic attributes in Table 2 demonstrates, therefore, that members of the Planning Committee were generally older, with a higher educational level, had attended more conferences, and were more equally represented by both sexes than all other participant groups.

Conference Effectiveness

Overall conference effectiveness was determined by analyzing conferee responses to three parts of the Welden Scale. The three parts analyzed were Satisfactions, Importance of Values and Achievement of Values.

Satisfactions

The variable Satisfaction contained thirty statements. Respondents were asked to rank each statement on a continuum from one, Strongly Disagree to five, Strongly Agree. The mean scores all clustered on the positive side of the continuum between undecided and agree. The results are reported in Table 3.

TABLE 3

ANOVA OF OVERALL CONFERENCE SATISFACTION BASED ON
SELECTED CRITERIA AS ASCRIBED BY EACH
PARTICIPANT GROUP ON A FIVE POINT
SCALE

	Planning Committee	Feedback Committee	Feedback Committee	Control Group
Criterion:	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=15)	(n=24)
Satisfaction:				
M	3.45	3.73	3.56	3.49
SD	.41	.25	.47	.58
	(F = .37	df = 3,46)		

There was, at the .05 level, no significant differences among the Planning, Steering and Feedback Committees or the Control Group in conference satisfaction. Each participant group tended to be satisfied with the conference. The results found in Table 3 lead this researcher to fail to reject the null hypothesis:

Hls1: There are no differences in satisfaction of the learning experience among committees who varied in levels of participation.

Importance of Values and
Achievement of Values

The variables Importance of Values and Achievement of Values each contained twenty-four statements. For the Importance of Values, respondents were asked to rank each statement on a continuum from one, Unimportant, to four, Very Important. For the Achievement of Values, respondents were asked to rank each statement on a continuum from one, Not at All, to four, Very Well. All participant group means fell between very important and important on the variable Importance of Values and between very well and well on the variable, Achievement of Values. The results are reported in Table 4.

It was found that the Importance of Selected Values was generally ranked as something more than just important to the participant groups. It was also found that the conference more than fairly well helped all participant groups achieve their values.

The results found in Table 3 lead this researcher, at the .05 level, to fail to reject the null hypothesis, Hls2 and Hls3 which are as follows:

There are no differences in values held among committees who varied in levels of participation; and

TABLE 4

ANOVA OF SELECTED VALUES HELD BY CONFEREES AND THE
ACHIEVEMENT OF SELECTED VALUES BY EACH COMMITTEE
AND THE CONTROL GROUP ON A FOUR POINT SCALE

Criterion	Planning Committee	Steering Committee	Feedback Committee	Control Group
	(n=6)	(n=5)	(n=15)	(n=24)
Selected Values				
M	3.41	3.10	3.35	3.30
SD	.36	.29	.34	.40
	(F = .77	df = 3,46		NS
Achievement of Values				
M	2.47	2.63	2.36	2.43
SD	.93	.57	.60	.67
	(F = .21	df = 3,46)		NS

There are no differences in the achievement
of values among committees who varied in
levels of participation.

Summary of Findings Regarding Conference Effectiveness and General Hypothesis H1

An analysis of the data gleaned from the Welden
Scale leads this researcher to fail to reject the three
null sub-hypotheses which are as follows:

H1s1: There are no differences in satisfaction of the
learning experience among committees who varied
in levels of participation.

Hls2: There are no differences in values held among committees who varied in levels of participation.

Hls3: There are no differences in the achievement of values among committees who varied in levels of participation.

Since at the .05 level, no significant differences could be found between any of the participant groups, the general hypothesis guiding this portion of the study was also rejected. This hypothesis was stated as follows:

H1: Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will perceive the effectiveness of the conference differently.

Conferee-Perceived Influence

A sociometric test (see Appendix D) was used to assess conferee-perceived influence. This sociometric test contained six component parts to assess conferee opinions who in their committee they perceived as being A. Most Influential, B. Best Ideas, C. Participated the Most, D. Most Positive Influence, E. Informal Conversations, and F. Like to Consult. Four administrations of the test were conducted: at the end of the first week, at the end of the second week, during the middle of the third week and at the end of the third week of the conference.

First Sociometric Test

Analysis of the first sociometric test, given at the end of the first week of the conference, disclosed no significant differences among all participant groups for each characteristic. The data are outlined in Table 5.

TABLE 5

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED BY CONFEREES TO SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MEMBERS IN EACH CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON A THREE POINT SCALE (FIRST SOCIOMETRIC TEST)

Characteristic		Committee			
		Planning (n=6)	Steering (n=5)	Feedback (n=15)	Control (n=24)
A. Most Influential	M	1.63	1.76	1.62	1.30
	SD	.83	.72	.92	.80
		(F = .93	df = 3,46		NS
B. Best Ideas	M	1.99	1.40	1.95	1.88
	SD	.27	.43	.65	.78
		(F = .93	df = 3,46)		NS
C. Participated the Most	M	1.20	1.26	1.49	1.25
	SD	1.15	1.21	.67	1.04
		(F = .24	df = 3,46)		NS
D. Most Positive Influence	M	1.69	1.09	1.67	1.78
	SD	.97	1.11	.65	.79
		(F = 1.02	df = 3,46)		NS
E. Informal Conversations	M	1.79	2.25	2.04	1.92
	SD	.59	.56	.43	.54
		(F = .92	df = 3,46)		NS
F. Like to Consult	M	2.11	2.03	1.76	1.69
	SD	.66	.61	.72	.77
		(F = .70	df = 3,46)		NS

Since no significant differences existed among all participants groups for all characteristics the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

- H2s1: There are no differences in perception of those that are most influential among committees who varied in their level of participation.
- H2s2: There are no differences in perception of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s3: There are no differences in perception of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s4: There are no differences in perception of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s5: There are no differences in perceived desire to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s6: There are no differences in perceived desire to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

Second Sociometric Test

Analysis of the second sociometric test, given at the end of the second week of the conference, disclosed no

significant differences among all participant groups for all the characteristic except for F. Like to Consult. The data are outlined in Table 6.

TABLE 6

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED BY CONFEREES TO SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MEMBERS IN EACH CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON A THREE POINT SCALE (SECOND SOCIOMETRIC TEST)

Characteristic		Committee			
		Planning (n=6)	Steering (n=5)	Feedback (n=15)	Control (n=24)
A. Most Influential	M	1.94	2.36	1.56	1.49
	SD	.29	1.32	.93	.89
		(F = 1.52	df = 3,46)		NS
B. Best Ideas	M	2.09	1.50	1.77	1.74
	SD	.42	.87	.66	.94
		(F = .54	df = 3,46)		NS
C. Participated the Most	M	1.40	1.83	1.55	1.46
	SD	.84	1.14	.71	.92
		(F = .29	df = 3,46)		NS
D. Most Positive Influence	M	2.35	1.52	1.86	1.60
	SD	.54	.50	.70	.99
		(F = 1.53	df = 3,46)		NS
E. Informal Conversation	M	2.14	1.95	1.99	1.79
	SD	.43	.72	.62	.68
		(F = .61	df = 3,46)		NS
F. Like to Consult	M	2.40	1.68	2.10	1.63
	SD	.44	.32	.35	.85
		(F = 3.18	df = 3,46)		>.05

Since no significant differences existed among all participant groups for all characteristics but characteristic

F. Like to Consult, the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

- H2s1: There are no differences in perception of those that are most influential among committees who varied in their level of participation.
- H2s2: There are no differences in perception of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s3: There are no differences in perception of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s4: There are no differences in perception of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H2s5: There are no differences in perceived desire to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

For characteristic F. Like to Consult, the Planning Committees' mean score was the highest, 2.40, and the Control Groups' the lowest, 1.63. The Feedback Committees' mean score was 2.10 and the Steering Committees' was 1.68. Since significance on the variable, Like to Consult, did exist the null hypothesis H2s6:

There are no differences in perceived desire to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation, was rejected.

Third Sociometric Test

Analysis of the third sociometric test, given during the middle of the third week of the conference, disclosed significant differences among all participant groups for characteristics A. Most Influential, B. Best Ideas, and D. Most Positive Influence. No significant differences were discovered among all participant groups for characteristics C. Participated the Most, E. Informal Conversations and F. Like to Consult. The data are outlined in Table 7.

Since no significant differences existed among all participant groups for characteristics C. Participated the Most, E. Informal Conversations, and F. Like to Consult, the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

H2s3: There are no differences in perception of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.

H2s5: There are no differences in perceived desire to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

TABLE 7

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED BY CONFEREES TO SELECTED
CHARACTERISTICS OF MEMBERS IN EACH CONFERENCE
COMMITTEE ON A THREE POINT SCALE
(THIRD SOCIOMETRIC TEST)

Characteristic		Committee			
		Planning (n=6)	Steering (n=5)	Feedback (n=15)	Control (n=24)
A. Most Influential	M	2.07	2.40	1.90	1.32
	SD	.45	.42	.75	.90
		(F = 4.03)	df = 3,46)		>.05
B. Best Ideas	M	2.24	2.30	1.85	1.25
	SD	.32	.57	.84	.92
		(F = 4.23)	df = 3,46)		>.05
C. Participated the Most	M	1.33	1.71	1.54	1.68
	SD	.46	.51	.95	1.00
		(F = .29)	df = 3,46)		NS
D. Most Positive Influence	M	2.04	2.53	1.78	1.43
	SD	.50	.36	.84	.79
		(F = 3.57)	df = 3,46)		>.05
E. Informal Conversation	M	1.68	1.60	1.93	1.66
	SD	.98	.57	.51	.92
		(F = .41)	df = 3,46)		NS
F. Like to Consult	M	2.14	1.64	1.88	1.75
	SD	.35	.92	.62	.55
		(F = .89)	df = 3,46)		NS

H2s6: There are no differences in perceived desire to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

For characteristic A. Most Influential, the Steering Committee mean score was the highest, 2.40, and the Control Group the lowest, 1.32. The Planning Committees'

mean score was 2.07 and the Feedback Committees' was 1.90. Since significance on the variable, most influential, did exist, the null hypothesis H2s1:

There are no differences in perception of those that are most influential among committees who varied in their level of participation, was rejected.

For characteristic B. Best Ideas, the Steering Committees' mean score was the highest, 2.30 and the Control Groups' the lowest 1.25. The Planning Committees' mean score was 2.24 and the Feedback Committees' was 1.85. Significant differences among all participant groups did exist, therefore, the null hypothesis H2s2:

There are no differences in perception of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation, was rejected.

For characteristic D. Most Positive Influence, the Steering Committees' mean score was the highest, 2.53 and the Control Groups' the lowest, 1.43. The Planning Committees' mean score was 2.04 and the Feedback Committees' was 1.78. Since significance on the variable, most positive influence did exist, the null hypothesis H2s4:

There are no differences in perception of those that have exerted the most positive

influence among committees that varied in their level of participation, was rejected.

Fourth Sociometric Test

Analysis of the fourth sociometric test, given at the end of the third week of the conference, disclosed significant differences among all participant groups for characteristics A. Most Influential, and E. Informal Conversations. No significant differences were discovered among all participant groups for any other characteristic. The data are outlined in Table 8.

Since no significant differences existed among all participant groups for all characteristics but characteristic A. Most Influential and E. Informal Conversations, the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

H2s2: There are no differences in perception of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.

H2s3: There are no differences in perception of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.

H2s4: There are no differences in perception of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.

TABLE 8

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED BY CONFEREES TO SELECTED
CHARACTERISTICS OF MEMBERS IN EACH CONFERENCE
COMMITTEE ON A THREE POINT SCALE
(FOURTH SOCIOMETRIC TEST)

Characteristic		Committee			
		Planning (n=6)	Steering (n=5)	Feedback (n=15)	Control (n=24)
A. Most Influential	M	2.34	1.74	1.87	1.41
	SD	.42	.43	.87	.80
		(F = 2.78	df = 3,46)		>.05
B. Best Ideas	M	1.90	1.91	1.97	1.39
	SD	.28	.97	.81	.95
		(F = 1.73	df = 3,46)		NS
C. Participated the Most	M	1.83	1.71	1.36	1.44
	SD	.50	.96	.75	1.05
		(F = .51	df = 3,46)		NS
D. Most Positive Influence	M	2.05	1.60	1.93	1.56
	SD	.22	.91	.80	.83
		(F = 1.08	df = 3,46)		NS
E. Informal Conversation	M	2.22	1.53	2.14	1.58
	SD	.50	.36	.56	.87
		(F = 2.81	df = 3,46)		>.05
F. Like to Consult	M	1.83	2.30	1.93	1.77
	SD	.91	.44	.84	.65
		(F = .78	df = 3,46)		NS

H2s6: There are no differences in perceived desire to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

For characteristic A. Most Influential, the Planning Committees' mean score was the highest, 2.34 and the Control Groups' the lowest, 1.41. The Feedback Committees' mean

score was 1.87, and the Steering Committees' was 1.74. Since significance on the variable, most influential, did exist, the null hypothesis H2s1:

There are no differences in perception of those that are most influential among committees who varied in their level of participation, was rejected.

For characteristic E. Informal Conversations, the Planning Committees' mean score was the highest, 2.22 and the Steering Committees' the lowest, 1.53. The Feedback Committees' mean score was 2.14 and the Control Groups' was 1.58. Since significance on the variable, informal conversations, did exist, the null hypothesis H2s5:

There are no differences in perceived desire to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation, was rejected.

Summary of Data on Sociometric Tests and General Hypothesis H2

Analysis of each sociometric test given during the conference disclosed only minimal differences among all participant groups. The first test discovered no significant differences. The second test disclosed a significant difference for one characteristic, F. Like to Consult. The third test disclosed significant differences for characteristics A. Most Influential, B. Best Ideas, and D. Most

Positive Influence. The fourth test disclosed significant differences for characteristics A. Most Influential and E. Informal Conversations. Since the general hypothesis H2:

Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will be perceived as having different amounts of influence, was not supported by the data, it was rejected.

Conferee-Perceived Influence Over Time

Conferee perceived influence over time was studied by analyzing the rank of each committee for each test given. An attempt was made to discover if perceived influence changed for each committee from the beginning to the end of the conference. The data for each characteristic, or factor, for all four sociometric tests were analyzed for each participant group.¹

Planning Committee Tested Over Time

Analysis of the four sociometric tests for the Planning Committee disclosed no significant differences among all sociometric tests for any characteristic. The data are outlined in Table 9.

¹BMD02V - Analysis of Variance for Factorial Design - Version of July 22, 1965, Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA.

TABLE 9

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED OVER TIME BY CONFEREES TO
 SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANT GROUP
 MEMBERS ON A THREE POINT SCALE
 (PLANNING COMMITTEE)

Characteristic		Sociometric Test			
		1	2	3	4
A. Most Influential	M	1.63 (F = 1.58)	1.94 df = 3,15)	2.07	2.34
B. Best Ideas	M	1.99 (F = 1.16)	2.10 df = 3,15)	2.24	1.90 NS
C. Participated the Most	M	1.20 (F = .77)	1.40 df = 3,15)	1.33	1.83
D. Most Positive Influence	M	1.69 (F = 1.11)	2.35 df = 3,15)	2.04	2.05 NS
E. Informal Conversation	M	1.79 (F = .90)	2.14 df = 3,15)	1.68	2.22 NS
F. Like to Consult	M	2.11 (F = .15)	2.40 df = 3,15)	2.14	1.83

Since no significant differences existed for the Planning Committee over time for all characteristics, the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

H3s1: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that are most influential among committees that varied in their level of participation.

- H3s2: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s3: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s4: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s5: There are no differences in perceived desire at different times, to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s6: There are no differences in perceived desire, at different times, to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

Steering Committee Tested
Over Time

Analysis of the four sociometric tests for the Steering Committee disclosed no significant differences among all sociometric tests for any characteristic. The data are outlined in Table 10.

TABLE 10

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED OVER TIME BY CONFEREES TO
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANT GROUP
MEMBERS ON A THREE POINT SCALE
(STEERING COMMITTEE)

Characteristic	Sociometric Test			
	I	2	3	4
A. Most Influential	M 1.76 (F = .86)	2.36 df = 3,15)	2.07	2.34 NS
B. Best Ideas	M 1.40 (F = 1.56)	1.50 df = 3,12)	2.30	1.91 NS
C. Participated the Most	M 1.26 (F = .45)	1.83 df = 3,12)	1.71	1.71 NS
D. Most Positive Influence	M 1.09 (F = 3.04)	1.52 df = 3,12)	2.53	1.60 NS
E. Informal Conversation	M 2.25 (F = 1.52)	1.95 df = 3,12)	1.60	1.53 NS
F. Like to Consult	M 2.03 (F = 1.06)	1.68 df = 3,12)	1.64	2.30 NS

Since no significant differences existed for the Steering Committee over time, for all characteristics, the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

H3s1: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that are most influential among committees, that varied in their level of participation.

- H3s2: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s3: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s4: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s5: There are no differences in perceived desire at different times, to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s6: There are no differences in perceived desire, at different times, to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

Feedback Committee Tested
Over Time

Analysis of the four sociometric tests for the Feedback Committee disclosed no significant differences among all sociometric tests for any characteristic. The data are outlined in Table 11.

TABLE 11

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED OVER TIME BY CONFEREES TO
 SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANT GROUP
 MEMBERS ON A THREE POINT SCALE
 (FEEDBACK COMMITTEE)

Characteristic		Sociometric Test			
		1	2	3	4
A. Most Influential	M	1.62 (F = .64)	1.56 df = 3,42)	1.90	1.87 NS
B. Best Ideas	M	1.95 (F = .24)	1.77 df = 3,42)	1.85	1.97 NS
C. Participated the Most	M	1.49 (F = .32)	1.55 df = 3,42)	1.54	1.36 NS
D. Most Positive Influence	M	1.67 (F = .51)	1.86 df = 3,42)	1.78	1.93 NS
E. Informal Conversation	M	2.04 (F = .47)	1.99 df = 3,42)	1.93	2.14 NS
F. Like to Consult	M	1.76 (F = .64)	2.10 df = 3,42)	1.88	1.93 NS

Since no significant differences existed for the Feedback Committee over time, for all characteristics, the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

H3s1: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that are most influential among committees that varied in their level of participation.

- H3s2: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s3: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s4: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s5: There are no differences in perceived desire at different times, to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.
- H3s6: There are no differences in perceived desire, at different times, to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

Control Group Tested Over Time

Analysis of the four sociometric tests for the Control Group disclosed a significant difference among all sociometric tests for the characteristic B. Best Ideas. No significant difference was discovered for any other characteristic. The data are outlined in Table 12.

TABLE 12

ANOVA OF INFLUENCE ASCRIBED OVER TIME BY CONFEREES TO
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANT GROUP
MEMBERS ON A THREE POINT SCALE
(CONTROL GROUP)

Characteristic		Sociometric Test			
		1	2	3	4
A. Most Influential	M	1.30 (F = .35)	1.49 df = 3,69)	1.32	1.41 NS
B. Best Ideas	M	1.88 (F = 3.45)	1.71 df = 3,69)	1.25	1.39 >.05
C. Participated the Most	M	1.25 (F = 1.60)	1.46 df = 3,69)	1.69	1.44 NS
D. Most Positive Influence	M	1.78 (F = .91)	1.60 df = 3,69)	1.43	1.56 NS
E. Informal Conversation	M	1.92 (F = 1.60)	1.79 df = 3,69)	1.66	1.58 NS
F. Like to Consult	M	1.69 (F = .19)	1.63 df = 3,69)	1.75	1.77 NS

Since no significant differences existed for the Control Group for all characteristics but B. Best Ideas, the following null hypotheses were not rejected:

H3s1: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that are most influential among committees that varied in their level of participation.

H3s3: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have participated the most among committees that varied in their level of participation.

H3s4: There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have exerted the most positive influence among committees that varied in their level of participation.

H3s5: There are no differences in perceived desire at different times, to have informal conversations with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

H3s6: There are no differences in perceived desire, at different times, to consult with members of committees that varied in their level of participation.

For characteristic B. Best Ideas, the first test mean score was the highest 1.88 and the third test the lowest, 1.25. The second test mean score was 1.71 and the fourth test was 1.39. The Control Group was perceived as having better ideas at the beginning than at the end of the conference. Therefore the null hypothesis H3s2:

There are no differences in perception, at different times, of those that have the best ideas among committees that varied in their level of participation,

was rejected.

Summary of Committees Tested Over
Time and General Hypothesis H 3

Analysis of all committees tested over time disclosed a significant difference for the Control Group in one characteristic, B. Best Ideas. The Control Group was perceived as having better ideas at the beginning than at the end of the conference. No significant differences existed for any other participant group for all other characteristics. Therefore, the general hypothesis H3:

Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will be perceived as having different amounts of influence at different times throughout the conference,

was rejected.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter is organized into three parts. Part one deals with the objectives and methodology of the study. Part two deals with findings related to the demographic attributes of conference participants, the testing of the general hypotheses which formed the basis of this study and conclusions. Part three deals with limitations of the study, implications for research and practice as well as suggestions for the design of research in the area of participation.

Objectives and Methodology

Objectives of the Study

Much of the rhetoric of educators of adults revolves around the principle that learners should participate in planning their educational program. In order to determine the validity of such rhetoric, this study probed into selected learner participational factors and their effect on learner ascribed educational effectiveness. More specifically, the objectives of this study were, (1) to assess conferee ascribed conference effectiveness as affected by

differences in participational activities and (2) to assess whether conference participants who were most central to program decision making were perceived by other conferees as more influential than those who were least central.

Methodology

The Florida Institute for Correctional Educators was conducted by the Department of Adult Education, Florida State University, under the joint sponsorship of the Florida Division of Corrections and The Florida Board of Regents.

The Institute was comprised of fifty educators from the several Florida correctional institutions. Prior to the start of the conference, the Florida Division of Corrections selected ten educators, six of whom became participants, to serve on the conference Planning Committee. Two planning sessions were held with members of the committee and the conference staff. At the beginning of the conference, the Steering Committee and the Feedback Committee were randomly selected from conferees who had not participated in the Planning Committee. Those conferees not selected for any other participant group were placed in the study Control Group.

The Welden Scale was used to measure conference effectiveness. This instrument measured conference effectiveness on the following three items: Satisfaction, Values and Achievement of Values. A one-way analysis of variance

was used to analyze these data. The second objective, to assess conferee perceived influence, was measured by a sociometric instrument developed specifically for this conference. It measured six perceived characteristics, A. Most Influential, B. Best Ideas, C. Participated the Most, D. Most Positive Influence, E. Informal Conversations, and F. Like to Consult. A one-way analysis of variance was used to analyze these data.

Findings and Conclusions

The findings of this study are presented in two parts: first, demographic attributes of the study population; second, the tests of general hypotheses and conclusions drawn.

Demographic Attributes of Study Population

Analyzing the variable age, it was found that approximately two-thirds of the Planning Committee were in the 36-55 age group, while a majority of the members of all other participant groups were in the 21-35 age group. An analysis of the variable education shows that all of the members of the Planning Committee were involved in graduate study, while a majority of the Steering Committee was not. It was found that while a majority of the Feedback Committee, the Control Group and the conferees as a whole were involved in graduate study, some of the members were without a baccalaureate degree. The variable, number of conferences

attended, shows that while most of the Planning Committee had attended one or two conferences, most of the members of all other participant groups had not attended any other conference. In analyzing the variable sex, one finds that one-half of the Planning Committee were females while all members of the Steering Committee were males. Males also comprised a majority of the members of all other participant groups. A perusal of the demographic attributes in Table 2 demonstrates, therefore, that members of the Planning Committee were generally older, with a higher educational level, had attended more conferences, and were more equally represented by both sexes than all other participant groups.

Tests of Hypotheses

The first general hypothesis tested was H1:

Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will perceive the effectiveness of the conference differently.

Data used to test this hypothesis were collected from participant responses to the Welden Scale (see Appendix C). No significant differences, at the .05 level, were discovered among all participant groups for Satisfaction, Importance of Values to Individual or Achievement of Values. All participant groups tended to be satisfied with the conference and all participant groups believed that the conference aided in achieving selected values. Therefore,

the first general hypothesis was rejected. One may conclude that participation at various levels in the planning and implementation of the conference program has made no difference insofar as conferee satisfaction with the program is concerned and that participation at various levels in the planning and implementation of the conference program has made no difference in the extent to which conferees perceived the conference as being helpful in the achievement of selected values.

The second general hypothesis tested was H2:

Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will be perceived as having different amounts of influence.

The data were collected from participant responses to the sociometric test developed specifically for the conference. Participant groups, at the .05 level, were not perceived as significantly different insofar as influence is concerned. Therefore this general hypothesis was rejected. However, minimal differences were discovered. On the first test, none of the characteristics were significantly different. On the second test characteristic F. Like to Consult was significantly different with the Planning Committee perceived as the most positive participant group. On the third test characteristic A. Most Influential, B. Best Ideas and D. Most Positive Influence were significantly different.

For each of these characteristics the Steering Committee was perceived as the most positive participant group. On the fourth test, characteristic A. Most Influential and E. Informal Conversations were significantly different. For each of these characteristics, the Planning Committee was perceived as the most positive group. There appeared to be some vacillation of participant perception between the Planning Committee and the Steering Committee. Of a total of twenty-four (6 characteristics x 4 tests) possible characteristic differences, six were significantly different with the Planning and Steering committees each perceived for three characteristics as the most positive participant group. Though the data were not statistically significant, one could postulate that there appears to be some difference in how those conferees who are more involved in program planning and implementation (Planning and Steering) are perceived as opposed to those conferees who are less involved (Feedback and Control). However, since statistically no one participant group was perceived as having more influence on the program content and structure than another, one could conclude that centrality to decision making may not be the only crucial or important variable in affecting participation.

The third general hypothesis tested was H3:

Committees with different levels of participation in planning and implementing a conference will

be perceived as having different amounts of influence at different times throughout the conference.

The data were collected from participant responses to the sociometric test developed specifically for the conference. Each participant group was compared with conferee perceptions of that group over the four tests to discern if perceived influence changed during the course of the conference. Participant groups, at the .05 level, were not perceived as significantly different insofar as influence over time is concerned. Therefore, the general hypothesis was rejected. However, a significant difference for characteristic B. Best Ideas was found in testing the Control Group. This group was found to be perceived as having better ideas at the beginning of the conference than at the end. One may conclude that as the conference progressed those conferees not assigned to any participatory activity were perceived as having a decreasing degree of ideational ability.

Limitations of the Study, Implications and Suggestions

Limitations of the Study

Certain limitations concerning the investigation should be identified and kept in mind for more meaningful interpretation.

The population for this study was selected by administrators in the Florida Division of Corrections and represented less than one-half of all educators in the Division. The criteria used by the administrators for selecting conference participants was not made entirely clear, however, a random selection of participants seemed to be precluded. The demographic data provided descriptive information of all the participants. Since the findings, indicated by the demographic data, do not demonstrate that the Planning Committee, selected by the Florida Division of Corrections, was representative of the total population, one must question the extent to which they represented the needs and concerns actually felt by correctional educators.

The conferees spent three weeks in one housing area, the Driftwood Motel, Tallahassee, Florida. They were released from their obligation for attendance only at the end of each week for a brief weekend respite. Their level of participation was defined structurally although an attempt was made to assess the effects of such different levels of participation, i.e., policy making, planning and implementing the conference. Since the participatory activities were structured by this researcher, some bias may have been introduced. Also, due to a high degree of socializing which was not controlled, much physical and psychological participation was not measured or considered by the research design. Participants not assigned to any committee may

have had various degrees of influence. That is, the Control Group members, because of their social behavior may have exerted undesirable informal influences on various committee members which could not have been taken into account in assessing the data.

Implications

Implications for Research and Practice

The analytical orientation of this study was based on that part of the rhetoric of adult educators dealing with the inherent goodness of allowing adult learners to participate in the planning and implementation of their educational program. The nature of this rhetoric precludes an orientation which separates research from practice. In researching the feasibility of allowing adults to participate, one must structure participatory experiences for adults. The dearth of studies precludes a comparative analysis.

It appears that from the findings, the extent to which conferees participate in planning and implementing a conference has little effect on conference outcomes. However, the following questions remain unanswered. Would the conference have been rated as satisfactory if no conferees participated in the planning and implementation? Would the conferees have achieved their values to a greater or lesser degree with no participation? Would structured

participant groups be perceived, by other conferees, differently with other types of structured participatory activities?

The look of the future in adult education will be determined by the nature of today's research and its impact on the research of tomorrow. This study demonstrates the practicality of research in the participational activities of adults in education. The effect of this study on the practitioner of adult education may reinforce attitudes held dear in the past. Such reinforcement may be dysfunctional. For those educators who do not believe adults are able to plan their own educational activity, this study will serve as support. For those who are ambivalent concerning the participation of adults in education, this study will not sway. However, for those who firmly hold to the concept of participation, this study should encourage further research to support their contention.

Suggestions for the Design of Future Research in the Area of Participation

In an effort to help answer the questions raised in the previous section, it is suggested that conferences of varying lengths, from one day to three weeks, be structured as follows:

1. A Planning Committee be randomly selected from future conferees and a pre-conference planning session conducted.

2. A Planning Committee and a Steering Committee randomly selected from future conferees and a pre-conference planning session conducted.
3. A Planning Committee, Steering Committee, and a Feedback Committee randomly selected from future conferees and a pre-conference planning session conducted.
4. All conferees serve as a Planning Committee and the planning session conducted at the beginning of a conference.
5. A mailed questionnaire provided to each of the preceding combinations in lieu of the planning session.
6. No conference participatory activity structured.

The preceding combinations of participatory activities could be structured for one day conferences, two day conferences and conferences of other time lengths. The Welden Scale could be administered during the last two hours of each conference. The sociometric test can be administered as often as future researchers desire, however, this researcher recommends that the best be administered to only the first five of the recommended possibilities and in relatively even time blocks. For example, a one or two day conference could have only one test administered. Conferences of more than two days can have two or more sociometric

tests administered, a one week conference might be tested on the second and last day.

The best structured participatory activity should be found for each of the differing conference time periods, therefore, this researcher suggests that no comparison, for purposes of discovering a best structure, be made between conferences of differing time periods. The best participatory structure should be found for each period of time. Such an effort would not be an easy research project. It would take several years to complete and may only be possible at large centers for continuing education. However, a slow deliberate start would be better than no start at all. Perhaps one could start by analyzing one day conferences. Another may analyze conferences of one week's duration. However, a start is made, let us continue.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PLANNING COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION

The following is an abstract of the pre-institute planning committee conference held at Florida State Prison, Raiford, Florida on February 4, 1971. Participants were Franklin M. Semberger, Mary Lisle King, and G. Ray Worley from The Department of Adult Education, Florida State University, as well as Wilson Bell, Walt J. Folardeau, Elmer Hines, Ty Jordan, Marshall Maddox, Douglas Romine, Michel Schotter, Jessie Swift, Kathleen Traywick, and Gloria Ward, representing teachers in the Florida Division of Corrections. Permission to make responses public could not be obtained, therefore anonymity was given all. The statements as reported are brief since no attempt was made to transcribe the entire session from recordings made. Each paragraph denotes the demarcation between participants.

"What is the role of the counselor? Should counseling be client or institution centered? Limitations of certain techniques in the institutional setting. The institution has some unique learners. We are more geared to cognitive structure. How can the teacher deal with changes in the affective domain also? Concerning the racial problem: How can you build consensus among diverse races? How to deal with the homosexual problem? What could, can, should, education be doing as part of

a pre-release problem? Can the education department be used as a means of reintegration of the inmate?"

"How to deal with the long sentence inmates who have been in prison for 10-15 years. These men have a different attitude. How to deal with exchange of cultural values in class. How to provide post-secondary, non-transfer enrichment courses. These would be for men who want to go beyond the GED and for those who don't want to go to Junior College. This plan could include courses such as: Sociology; Community Relation; Commercial subjects, such as usage of English and Grammar, how tools are used in outside world, social and civic competencies. Selection and placement of learners. There is need for more inmate input on school placement. Closeness or distance of instructor with the population with whom they work. Should the instructor become a surrogate father? How should this be different in correctional education?"

"There is need for resocialization in other areas of prison work. This should include other officers as well. There is two different worlds between the school and the wing (where the men live). Education should be considered in the placement and handling of inmates by the custodial officers. There is need for pre-release education for everyman. The present program is very selective. The present policy is to give a release a suit, twenty-five dollars and a bus ticket."

Materials should be adult oriented. There would be some value in the workshop for teachers to get together and share materials. Teachers could work together to develop course outlines and materials. At the Institute, let the participants have an experience in a group so they could go back and use the ideas. Let the counselors try to produce a counselors handbook, a guide to counselors. This would be an outline handbook for untrained counselors. More of lay counselor's handbook. Let part of the Institute be structured. It could be a condensed three weeks version of study on such as: Theories of learning; Psychology of Criminology, etc. Devote the morning hours to getting hard facts. Have a display booth. Label materials, so can see what each Institution is doing or using. Also request chief suppliers to have a display. In making up course outlines, have written behavioral objectives. Need to verbalize what kind of change we desire in terms of a value system. Responsibility for others. We need to identify values important to develop in inmates, and to learn how to teach these. Perhaps to use role play. We need to try to pull in other agencies and see where these other agencies can help us in corrections. Such as: rehabilitation, Adult Education, Adult Vocational education. How use local agencies in educational program?"

"Improve working relations between employees or departments. Need more workshops and psychological training

for all employees rather than just custody. Team classification. Team made up of education officer, work supervisor, classification officer, dorm officer, custodial officer.

Deal with discipline. When a man goes to the box.

Library - more central location for drawing source materials.

Need a better source of learning materials. Ways to:

(1) Expand school release program to go to Junior College.

Need to help men to complete their AA degree. (2) Get more community involvement in inmate welfare. Business; fraternal organizations. (3) Find methods of post-release followup. What are men doing when they get out? Whether they take advantage of the programs offered?"

"Uniqueness of our students. Part of the problem is in our materials, so little for adults, less for correctional education. Promote closer relationship with the outside community. How to cooperate better?"

"Teachers bring and share materials. What are we trying to do? Horizontal and vertical communication. Include administration and other supervisors. Need to share feelings. How change can be brought about? Men who can make change and will. Problem people with security risks completing college degrees."

"Censorship and recovery of library books within the Institution. More coordination of preparation of courses and the library. Teacher may assign subjects, but don't have books, although could get them. Use of library

by inmate. They can only spend forty-five minutes in the library on their own time. As a teacher it is impossible to make assignments requiring research. Men steal books from one another, and from the library--walk out with them. Have several days amnesty. Also problem about mutilation. Maintain comprehensive telephone directory depository--to help inmate work out parole plans, to locate employers. Need a law library. A room with typewriters and materials for doing research. Can use typewriters for typing writs. Administration could deal with this as policy."

"Counseling program, many people are problem inmates. Counsel with them, reality counseling. Help individual adjust to institution and supervision. Many inmates are anti or dyssocial. How to handle the dogmatism of job supervisors. Many inmates want to take Junior College courses, but not the Liberal Arts; rather, management, etc. Need programs like airframe and power plant, prepare them immediately for a vocational plan. Change of time span for GVR (achievement examination). It is currently administered every 3 months in order to qualify for GED. This makes the students test-oriented. Plus, it is too much paper work for the staff. Therefore, there is need for greater time span between administering the GVR. GVR was chosen in the summer of 1968. More on the basis of trying to find something to use."

✓

"Need to do something with evaluation of the total program. Have an outside team come in and evaluate us; similar to accreditation. Should be an impartial evaluation. Don't have tools for evaluation."

"Librarian visit in school and instruct in how to use the library correctly. Also library appreciation. Three thousand five hundred men in Florida State Prison, yet only 10% in school. Yet have not idea how to use the card catalogue and references."

"Change academic year, to allow breaking period of about one month, to permit pre-planning by the teacher. Have teacher develop courses, with instructional objectives."

"As state agency, have line/staff organization."

"Need administration together. See great difference in most institutions. If there is a strong supervisor of education in an institution, he can do what he wants to do. Perhaps need to get the Central office to say that there will be a pre-school planning period."

"Have to go through 30 pages of paper to get a Federal project approved in FDC. Question whether it would be possible to have a letter from the Central office to the effect that the people on the planning committee be in Tallahassee at the Institute? Seems policy is for those with a temporary certificate to attend."

"Need help in designing first institute to help most experienced teachers. Develop criteria for correctional

officers at the Academy. Vital to bring in people higher up in the hierarchy. Training members there to go back and share information, ideas--be part of staff development."

"Fifty percent of teachers have a temporary certificate. Have to agree to give time."

"Present educational supervisors were the former recreation leaders. When they instituted the new program, they just moved them into the new slots. Some have superior supervisors. Have problem with institutional pressures. Most say, 'don't rock the boat.' 'Don't make waves.'"

"Educational system ought to be under the State Department of Education. To do this, would mean changes structurally. Central office educators are dependent on non-educators. When the chips are down, the central office supports the superintendent."

"Remember, the education division is only two years old. There were/are no job specification for educators in the system. Teachers have to strive to get along with the custodial staff."

"Should we try to involve some custodial persons in the Institute. How to affect change in them?"

"Greatest need is lack of effective leadership."

"Need change in structure. A mandate from Tallahassee."

"How to form change groups. Get professionally trained people who can help train teachers to develop skills

similar to those of a community change agent. Need help from experts."

"Invite book companies to put on displays. Don't invite Noble and Noble--they have nothing in Adult Education. Cambridge is also poor. Find those in Adult Education--Behavioral Research, Palo Alto; La Follete--for the slow learner."

"Resource persons do not have ivory tower people. Want input people who know what exists and who have some success in their work. Want something like old classes, with lectures and handouts."

"Need theoretical input and group meetings. Group meetings which pose problems, a case study or simulated problem, or get problems from the group."

"Plan for findings/proceedings. Build in plans for compilation or summary of what is accomplished."

"Envision groups as being cohesive. Let each group crank out a five or six page paper on each activity, etc."

"Have on hand a nucleus of a library for reference."

The participants all agreed that the following outline for the content of the Florida Institute for Correctional Educators was appropriate.

I. COUNSELING TECHNIQUES (Twenty percent of total time)

- (a) Overview
- (b) Types
- (c) Psychology

II. INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES (Twenty percent of total time)

- (a) Uniqueness of adult inmates as learners
- (b) Materials
- (c) Individualized instruction
- (d) Course development-communication skills

III. RE-SOCIALIZATION--WHAT VALUES? (Twenty percent of total time)

IV. HOW IS CHANGE BROUGHT ABOUT? (Forty percent of total time)

- (a) Inter, Intra institutional relationships/communications
- (b) How are problems identified?
- (c) Who can bring about change?

APPENDIX B

STEERING COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION

RESULTS OF THE FIRST STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

The following suggested topic additions are the results of the first Steering Committee meeting. The committee, receiving inputs from their Feedback Committee, listed all topics, then rank ordered them as statements:

1. Have someone explain the community correctional center concept.
2. How does the central office allocate resources?
3. Schedule Dr. Higgins and Mrs. Traquick (both participants) to explain their teaching techniques and/or learner motivation.
4. Tour the Federal Correctional Institution at Tallahassee.
5. Have inmates and custodial staff participate in group discussions.
6. Have someone explain the program at Sumpter Correctional Institution.

Since this input was considered as very important by the conference director, all topics were added to the program.

APPENDIX C

WELDEN SCALE

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your thinking about the program in which you are participating. Your answers will be helpful in determining the effectiveness of this conference and in the future planning of similar programs.

The form is designed to help you record your opinions quickly and easily. There are separate instructions for each part of the questionnaire. Read these instructions carefully before answering the questions. Please answer all statements.

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. You may be completely frank in your replies. Do not sign your name.

PART I - SATISFACTIONS

96

Directions:

Read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about ... You will agree with some statements and disagree with others. You are offered five possible answers to each statement. The "undecided" answer should be circled only when you have no opinion. Circle one number following each statement. Please answer all statements.

Example:

The city needs to improve garbage collection schedules.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Un- decided	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

This person feels in no uncertain terms that garbage collection schedules are inadequate.

In regard to this conference I feel that:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Un- decided	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree
1. The purposes of this program were clear to me	5	4	3	2	1
2. The objectives of this program were not realistic	5	4	3	2	1
3. Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently	5	4	3	2	1
4. The participants accepted the purposes of this program	5	4	3	2	1
5. The objectives of this program were not the same as my objectives	5	4	3	2	1
6. I didn't learn anything new	5	4	3	2	1
7. The material presented was valuable to me	5	4	3	2	1
8. I could have learned as much by reading a book	5	4	3	2	1
9. Possible solutions to my problems were considered	5	4	3	2	1
10. The information presented was too elementary	5	4	3	2	1
11. The speakers really knew their subjects	5	4	3	2	1
12. The discussion leaders were not well prepared	5	4	3	2	1
13. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topics presented	5	4	3	2	1
14. Too much jargon was used by the leaders	5	4	3	2	1
15. We worked together as a group	5	4	3	2	1
16. We did not relate theory to practice	5	4	3	2	1
17. The sessions followed a logical pattern	5	4	3	2	1
18. The schedule was too fixed	5	4	3	2	1
19. The group discussions were excellent	5	4	3	2	1
20. There was very little time for informal conversation	5	4	3	2	1
21. I did not have an opportunity to express my ideas	5	4	3	2	1
22. I really felt a part of this group	5	4	3	2	1
23. My time and money were well spent	5	4	3	2	1
24. The program met my expectations	5	4	3	2	1
25. I have no guide for future action	5	4	3	2	1
26. The seats were uncomfortable	5	4	3	2	1
27. The meeting rooms were clean and attractive	5	4	3	2	1
28. Recreational facilities were inadequate	5	4	3	2	1
29. The food services were poor	5	4	3	2	1
30. Everything was done for my physical comfort	5	4	3	2	1

PART II - IMPORTANCE OF VALUES TO INDIVIDUAL

97

Directions:

People have many different values. You will feel that some statements listed below are more important than others. Read each statement carefully and decide how important it is to you. You are offered four possible answers to each statement. Circle one number following each statement. Please answer all statements.

I feel that for me:	Very Important	Impor- tant	Slightly Important	Unim- portant
31. Increasing effectiveness in my chosen profession is	4	3	2	1
32. Satisfying my curiosity is	4	3	2	1
33. Improving my leadership skills is	4	3	2	1
34. Reducing my doubts about life is	4	3	2	1
35. Making new friends is	4	3	2	1
36. Finding answers to my questions is	4	3	2	1
37. Planning for my future is	4	3	2	1
38. Becoming a more worthy person is	4	3	2	1
39. Improving my business decisions is	4	3	2	1
40. Getting some new ideas is	4	3	2	1
41. Confirming my loyalty to a group is	4	3	2	1
42. Developing higher ethical standards is	4	3	2	1
43. Solving a problem related to my job is	4	3	2	1
44. Accumulating concrete facts is	4	3	2	1
45. Seeing another person's point of view is	4	3	2	1
46. Discovering new insights is	4	3	2	1
47. Enjoying pleasant physical surroundings is	4	3	2	1
48. Fitting together theory and practice is	4	3	2	1
49. Giving information to other people is	4	3	2	1
50. Spending time in reflection and speculation is	4	3	2	1
51. Increasing competency in my present job is	4	3	2	1
52. Developing new intellectual interests is	4	3	2	1
53. Accepting responsibility for a group's performance is	4	3	2	1
54. Seeing well arranged exhibits is	4	3	2	1

PART IV - ACHIEVEMENT OF VALUES

Directions:

Conferences can achieve many different kinds of values. Read each statement carefully and decide how well it was achieved in this conference. Precede every statement with "In my opinion, this conference . . ." then respond to that statement by circling the number which best expresses your opinion. Please answer all statements.

In my opinion, this conference:	<u>Very well</u>	<u>Well</u>	<u>Fairly well</u>	<u>Not at all</u>
75. Increased my effectiveness in my chosen profession	4	3	2	1
76. Satisfied my curiosity	4	3	2	1
77. Improved my leadership skills	4	3	2	1
78. Reduced my doubts about life	4	3	2	1
79. Allowed me to make new friends	4	3	2	1
80. Supplied answers to my questions	4	3	2	1
81. Helped me to plan for my future	4	3	2	1
82. Aided me in becoming a more worthy person	4	3	2	1
83. Suggested ways to improve my business decisions	4	3	2	1
84. Provided me with new ideas	4	3	2	1
85. Confirmed my loyalty to this group	4	3	2	1
86. Helped me develop higher ethical standards	4	3	2	1
87. Solved a problem related to my job	4	3	2	1
88. Provided me with concrete facts	4	3	2	1
89. Helped me to see another person's point of view	4	3	2	1
90. Provided me with new insights	4	3	2	1
91. Afforded me an opportunity to enjoy pleasant physical surroundings . .	4	3	2	1
92. Helped me to fit together theory and practice	4	3	2	1
93. Permitted me to give information to other people	4	3	2	1
94. Provided time for reflection and speculation	4	3	2	1
95. Increased my competency in my present job	4	3	2	1
96. Developed new intellectual interests for me	4	3	2	1
97. Permitted me to accept responsibility for the group's performance . . .	4	3	2	1
98. Provided an opportunity to see well arranged exhibits	4	3	2	1

Directions:

The following information is necessary for research purposes. Please answer the questions as accurately as you can. Do not sign your name. Read each question carefully and circle the number of the answer that applies for you.

99. AGE: (Circle one number)

- | | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 21 years or less | 1 |
| 21-35 years | 2 |
| 36-55 years | 3 |
| 55 years and above | 4 |

100. SEX: (Circle one number)

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Male | 1 |
| Female | 2 |

101. YOUR EDUCATION: (Circle highest number that applies)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Less than high school | 1 |
| Some high school | 2 |
| High School Graduate | 3 |
| Some college | 4 |
| College Graduate | 5 |
| Graduate study | 6 |

102. How many conferences have you attended previously that dealt with the same subject as this one?
(Circle one number)

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| None | 1 |
| One | 2 |
| Two | 3 |
| Three | 4 |
| Four | 5 |
| Five | 6 |
| Six | 7 |
| More than six | 8 |

103. Did you help to plan this conference?
(Circle one number)

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 2 |

APPENDIX D

SOCIOMETRIC TEST

- A. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have been most influential in your group discussions.
- B. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have had the best ideas during the group discussions.
- C. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have participated the most in your group discussions.
- D. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people you feel have exerted the most positive influence in directing your group discussions.
- E. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people with whom you would like to have informal conversations.
- F. From the list below, identify and rank order (1, 2, 3) three people with whom you would like to consult about the content and procedures used in the institute.

[illegible]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- A Design for Democracy. London: Max Parrish and Co. Ltd., 1956.
- Adult Education and Democracy. New York: American Association for Adult Education, 1936.
- Alinsky, Saul. Reveille for Radicals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Brunner, Edmund deS. and Associates. An Overview of Adult Education Research. Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of the USA, 1967.
- Dunham, Arthur. Community Welfare Organization. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1958.
- Gibb, J. R.; Platts, Grace N.; and Miller, Lorraine F. Dynamics of Participative Groups. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1951.
- Krech, David; Crutchfield, Richard; and Ballachez, Egerton L. Individual in Society. Iowa: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Lindemann, E. C. "The Authorities, Functions and Limitations of Committees," in Committees: Their Purposes, Functions and Administration by John J. Hader and E. C. Lindemann. New York: American Management Association, General Management Series No. 96, 1929.
- London, Jack. "Program Development in Adult Education," in Malcolm S. Knowles (ed.), Handbook of Adult Education in the United States. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the USA, 1960.
- McMonagle, James A., and Pfister, Emil R. The Membership Manual. New York: Vantage Press, 1970.
- Newcomb, Theodore M.; Turner, Ralph H.; Converse, Phillip E. Social Psychology: The Study of Human Interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Rossi, Peter H., and Dentler, Robert A. The Politics of Urban Renewal--The Chicago Findings. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

- Schroeder, Wayne L. "Adult Education Defined and Described," in Robert M. Smith, George F. Aker, J. R. Kidd (eds.), Handbook of Adult Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1970.
- Soltis, Jonas F. An Introduction to the Analysis of Educational Concepts. Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1968.
- Spiegel, Hans B. C. (ed.). Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.
- Trecker, A. R., and Trecker, H. B. Committee Common Sense. New York: Whiteside, Inc., and William Morrow and Co., 1954.
- Utterback, William. Group Thinking and Conference Leadership. Revised. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Zelko, Harold P. Successful Conference and Discussion Techniques. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.

Articles

- Anderson, Robert C.; Mawly, Russell G.; Miller, Joe A.; and Olson, Andrew L. "Parental Aspirations." Adult Leadership, Vol. 14 (May, 1965). p. 10.
- Boyle, Patrick G. "Planning with Principles." Adult Education, Vol. 9 (Autumn, 1958), p. 22.
- Bruner, Jerome. "The Skill of Relevance or the Relevance of Skills." Saturday Review (April 18, 1970), p. 68.
- Fauber, Julia Cole, and Laue, Gilbert. "Building Committees." Adult Leadership, Vol. 2 (September, 1953), p. 14.
- Grain, Robert L., and Rosenthal, Donald B. "Community Status as a Dimension of Local Decision Making." American Sociological Review, Vol. 32 (1967), p. 984.
- Hallenbeck, Wilbur C. "The Role of Adult Education in Society." Psychology Today, Vol. 4 (March, 1971), p. 9.

- Nisbet, Robert A. "The University Had Better Mind Its Own Business." Psychology Today, Vol. 4 (March, 1971), p. 31.
- Sherrard, Thomas D., and Murray, Richard C. "The Church and Neighborhood Community Organization." Social Work, Vol. 10 (July, 1965).
- Tomotsu, Shibutani. "Reference Groups as Perspectives." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 60 (1955), pp. 562-570.
- Wilson, James Q. "The Citizen in the Renewal Process." Journal of Housing, Vol. 29 (1963), p. 627.
- _____. "Planning and Politics." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 29 (November, 1963), p. 248.
- Zurcher, Louis A. "Selection of Indigenous Leadership." Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. 76 (1967), p. 31.
- Unpublished
- Welden, J. Eugene. "Program Planning and Program Effectiveness in University Residential Centers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1966.
- Workable Program for Community Improvement--Answers on Citizen Participation. Washington, D.C.: Housing and Urban Development, February, 1966.
- BMD02V - Analysis of Variance for Factorial Design - Version of July 22, 1965. Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA.
- BMD01V - Analysis of Variance for One-Way Design - Version of May 4, 1965. Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA.

VITA

Franklin M. Semberger

Birthdate/place: 21 August 1930, Yonkers, New York.

High School: Trenton High School, Trenton, New Jersey.

Colleges: Miami-Dade Community College, Miami, Florida,
1966-67 - AA

Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida,
1967-69 - BS

Graduate Education: Florida State University, Tallahassee,
1969-70 (MS in Adult Education)

Florida State University, Tallahassee,
1970-72 (Ph.D. in Adult Education)

Professional Experience:

Policeman, City of Miami, Florida, 1955-1965

Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice, Youngstown
State University, Youngstown, Ohio, 1971-72

Associate Professor of Social Work and Correctional
Services, East Carolina University, Greenville,
North Carolina, 1972